

Illinois Commerce Commission
SBC/Ameritech Illinois Merger, Docket 98-0555
Performance Benchmarks Collaborative, Condition 30
Final Meeting Minutes From 5/4-5/2000
Modified and Approved 6/6/2000

The fifth Illinois Performance Measure Collaborative was held on May 4 and 5, 2000 at the State of Illinois Building in Chicago, Illinois. Following are minutes and action items from that meeting.

Mr. McClerren, ICC Staff, presided over the meeting.

May 4, 2000

Mr. McClerren began the meeting with introductions , sign-in sheet, and a review of administrative matters as follows:

- I. Introductions
 - A Staff, Ameritech Illinois, CLECs, Other Parties
 - B Sign up sheet, with contact name, address, phone & e-mail address

- II. Administrative Matters
 - A Meeting Procedures
 - 1 Subject Matter Experts (SMEs) participation recommended
 - 2 Discussions “off the record” until final positions are developed
 - 3 Final positions, decisions, agreements, disagreements, documents to be documented
 - 4 Business casual attire
 - B ICC Web Site – Notices, Materials

- III. Review and approve meeting minutes from 3/28-29
 - A The review and approval of the meeting minutes were postponed until 5/5 due to the late distribution of the minutes.

- IV. Status of Ameritech Waiver Request
 - A A status hearing was held on 4/28 where both parties agreed that progress is being made in the negotiation of an agreement among the parties. As such, the next status is scheduled for 5/25/00.
 - B AT&T and MCI noted that they view resolution of the FOC “parity vs. benchmark” issue as including components of agreement on the benchmark levels. Final resolution depends on KPMG review of FOC intervals and issues regarding expanding the types of orders that flow through.
 - C Ameritech maintains the burden of proof in this proceeding.

- V. Gaining Access to Performance Measures
 - A Discussion:
 - 1 Ameritech re-iterated it’s proposal to provide the parties a contract amendment that would clearly establish which performance measures and remedies would be due customers under the merger agreements. Customers would sign the agreement and “opt in” to the performance measures and remedies established under the guidance of the collaborative and forego those related conditions in their interconnection agreements
 - 2 Parties suggested that this method presented an issue to those customers who purchased these services directly from the tariff offering. The CLEC and staff position was that some additional mechanism is required in order for these customers to “opt in” to the remedy plan

and measures. CLECs also said that the contract process can delay access to remedies because often objectionable conditions are included in the amendment and CLECs have to either accept them as is or arbitrate, causing more delays in obtaining remedies. Ameritech feels the amendment is generic and specific to the performance measures.

3 MCI noted that BA-PA and BA-NY did not require interconnection agreements. Ms. Kinard from MCI agreed to provide this documentation.

4 Ameritech agreed to discuss these points with the merger compliance attorneys and to establish the need (from an Ameritech perspective) to schedule an attorney conference call, through Mr. Trabaris of AT&T, to discuss the matter. Subsequently Ameritech informed Mr. Trabaris that Ameritech did not see the need for a conference call, but would work to make tariff language available to CLECs who do not have interconnection agreements.

B During this discussion, AT&T requested that Ameritech work with CLECs to identify enhancements to the CLEC Online web-site from SBC.

1 AT&T requested that a more efficient manner to download the data could be had if Ameritech could move to posting an MS Access file on the web.

2 Ameritech responded that they would attempt to convene a call with internal I/T resources to establish what enhancements could be undertaken. Subsequently, Ameritech has determined that there is a need for consistency among the PM web pages and has undertaken an effort to modify the site. Ameritech has requested that any comments (requests, design ideas, etc.) related to the modification of the web-site should be forwarded to Mr. Fioretti.

VI. Discussion of additional topics – It was determined that Items VI, VII, VIII and IX on the agenda would be discussed together.

A Performance Measures 107-122, Disaggregation of Data, Business rules and formulas for certain performance measures are addressed in both the attached PM matrix used in the discussion and in specific comments by the parties listed below.

B Comments:

1 Measures 107-109 – Collocation

- Discussion of the agreements reached in earlier PM collaboratives identified that the participants in attendance at this meeting feel differently than when the original meetings took place regarding parity vs. benchmarks for these measures. The documented (meeting minutes) agreement at previous meetings established these measures as those to be measured as parity with Ameritech affiliates until a 6-month review. The CLEC participants requested that Ameritech poll all participants in the earlier meeting to review this decision. If CLECs determined that moving back to the benchmark measure is appropriate, Ameritech would be required to file additional waiver requests. Ameritech will send an email to previous session participants to address this issue, and will if there is some consensus, consider filing an additional waiver request.
- MCI requested that Ameritech check MI transcript with respect to comments from SME's on collocation augments. MCI's SMEs wanted to know why there were limits on the number of DS1, DS3, and wire cabling for the 30-day augment interval. AIT requires CLECs to hire a contractor to do ties so as long as sufficient terminating equipment is there, no limit on capacity should be relevant. Also, WorldCom asked whether adding DSLAMs to existing collos could be included in the 30 day augment group.
- CLECs also requested that Ameritech consider establishing and posting (on the web) a checklist of items, which when completed, would constitute a completed collocation. Ameritech will forward the request on to the Collocation product manager. This was in context of measure 107 and BA wording established to identify when a collocation is complete and ready for occupancy

2 Measures 110-113 – Directory Database

- Ameritech and CLECs disagree over the benchmark (48 vs. 72 hours)

- CLECs proposed new measure 112.1 to establish the mean time to correct DB errors reported by CLECs. Ameritech reported that these would be measured under measure 110.
- 3 Measures 114-116 – Coordinated Cutovers
- Parties agreed to discuss these measures in detail at the next meeting. Ameritech agreed to bring in SMEs who have been working with CLECs in Wisconsin workshop to review the process and discuss these measurements (including 114.1 from TX).
 - Measure 116 is considered by all technically infeasible.
- 4 Measures 117-119 – NXX
- Measures 117-118 – Ameritech stated that LRNs are loaded once and all IL switches are converted to LNP. Only appropriate when new switch is added. Sal brought up the red line in business rules and stated that if there are no interconnection trunks, an NXX can't be programmed and can't be tested.
 - MCI & Sprint suggested replacing the language with an exclusion for CLEC caused misses. Sal agreed to revise the language.
 - There was a discussion regarding expedited treatment (SBC or CLEC) and Sal stated that the expedite would have to be through the 3rd party vendor who administers the LERG (NeuStar).
 - There was agreement from all parties that 117 is "parity".
 - Sprint questioned disaggregation and Sal stated that it is likely by region since there's one center. Sal agreed to investigate to see if it could be done at a state level
 - Measure 119 - Issue of multiple tickets on same trouble case. CLECs suggested that a confirmation call with the CLEC should be required prior to closing out the trouble ticket. Sal agreed to check into modifying the language.
 - Sal stated that SBC/Ameritech prefers parity vs. 1 hour benchmark.
 - If SBC (Texas) states "parity" and collaborative parties agree to "benchmark", is a waiver from the ICC necessary? Sam indicated that it would.
- 5 Measures 120-121 Bona Fide Requests
- Sal distributed the BFR process document, which is available on TCnet, and reviewed the highlights of the process.
 - The 30 business days should be changed to 30 calendar days in the business rules.
 - For 121, TCnet indicates 90 days and the business rules indicate 45 days.
 - MCI asked if an arbitrated agreement would supercede the intervals (for remedy purposes) contained in Performance Measures.
 - Sal stated that if 120 & 121 were changed back to a "benchmark", it would require a waiver to be filed with the ICC.
 - Sal indicated that he needed to review "new" policy regarding Special Construction, which was created in response to Stankey's commitments in Ohio.

VII. Set Meeting Dates

- Next meetings 6/6 (10:30-6c) 6/7 (9-3c), 7/11-12
- Measures 79-106 need CLECs to identify issues. Conference call will be set up for 5/15 @ 9-11c (Bob will set up call).
- Janeen will provide marked up copy with CLEC comments by 5/22.
- Conference call to review comments with Sal on 5/30 @ 9-10c

Close

- Sal agreed to bring the new combined matrix document to the next meeting and review the possibility of putting the report into the "North Carolina" format (at Sam's request).
- Sam recapped the meeting and reviewed the upcoming meeting schedule and conference calls.